The Oregonian

PORTLAND, OREGON.

Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as Second-class Matter.
Subscription Rates—Invariably in Advance.

(BY MAIL.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	$8.00
Daily, Sunday included, six months	4.25
Daily, Sunday included, three months	2.25
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75
Daily, without Sunday, one year	6.00
Daily, without Sunday, six months	3.25
Daily, without Sunday, three months	1.75
Daily, without Sunday, one month	.60
Weekly, one year	1.50
Sunday, one year	2.50
Sunday and Weekly, one year	3.50

(BY CARRIER.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	9.00
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75

How to Remit—Send Postoffice money order, express order or personal check on your local bank. Stamps, coin or currency are at the sender's risk. Give postoffice address in full, including county and state.

Postage Rates—10 to 14 pages, 1 cent; 16 to 28 pages, 2 cents; 30 to 40 pages, 3 cents; 40 to 60 pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage, double rate.

Eastern Business Offices—Verree & Conklin—New York, Brunswick building. Chicago, Steger building.

San Francisco Office—R. J. Bidwell Co., 742 Market street.

European Office—No. 3, Regent street, S. W., London.

PORTLAND, SUNDAY, NOV. 24, 1912.

BRYAN IN WILSON'S CABINET?

President-elect Wilson will probably offer Mr. Bryan a place in his Cabinet, as Secretary of State. It is a great position, honored by the illustrious names of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Webster, Marcy, Seward, Blaine and others of the Nation's distinguished men.

The precedent of Jefferson or Clay or Blaine, or others of the people's idols, in entering the Nation's service as the premier of another's Cabinet may well be pleaded for Bryan. Greater men have thought it comported with their own dignity and the general estimation of their merits and deserts. They have found in the Secretaryship of State a solace for disappointed ambition and an opportunity for promotion of cherished public policies. In the early days of the Republic it served as an avenue for final attainment of the Presidency. In later days no Secretary of State has become President; but Bryan might prove himself an exception to the new rule, as Roosevelt demonstrated that one who had been chosen for Vice-President could not thus be disqualified for popular election to the Presidency.

Yet the reasons that may require Wilson to offer Bryan a Cabinet place are not the reasons that may, or should, persuade Bryan to accept. Nor are the other reasons which might appear to entitle him to take a place behind the Wilson throne as cogent as the reasons which would suggest that he remain a Commoner of the people. Probably it is as clear to Bryan as it is to his numerous critics that as a Cabinet officer he would at once lose his identity as an unshackled tribune of the people. He could never speak for Bryan; he must always speak and act for Wilson. Bryan with a gag is unthinkable; Bryan without a gag in the Wilson Cabinet is impossible.

An even more important reason why Bryan should and probably will decline is that as Wilson's premier he would become at once an issue, and probably a vital issue, within the Democratic party; and Wilson would necessarily be involved. Speaker Clark and Mr. Underwood would be mortally offended; the Southern Democracy and the Eastern Democracy would deeply resent it; and all the other historic elements of opposition to Bryan and Bryanism would at once be crystallized into a powerful unit of antagonism. Beginning his four years with a fierce war over Bryan would make a sad prospect for President Wilson.

Probably Mr. Wilson will offer Bryan a Cabinet job, but it will be with a devout prayer that it will be declined.

FACTS ROOSEVELT OVERLOOKS.

Before the election Roosevelt was confidently predicting victory; after the election he congratulated himself and his followers on the fact that they polled so many votes, though far short of enough, in view of the many handicaps under which he labored. Then he reveals that peculiar twist in his brain which inhibits his perception of facts obvious to everybody else and invents facts which are obvious to nobody else.

The Oregonian cannot refrain from calling attention to a few of the facts which the Colonel conveniently forgets and to the facts which are perceptible to none except him and those who see through his spectacles.

He refers to the "theft of the Republican organization by the Republican bosses," which has been proved not to have been committed, but ignores the contests by which his own managers tried to seat 164 fraudulent delegates and thus to steal the Republican organization.

Roosevelt says his campaign was conducted "without much money and against the wealth of the country," though he was backed by more money than any other candidate and had behind him a galaxy of millionaires. His party is above all a rich man's party.

"Without any organization, against the entire organized political ability of the country," says the Colonel's statement. Then what has the great Senator Dixon been doing all these months? Did he not form an organization? Did not Ormsby McHarg frame up those Southern contests? Have Bill Flinn, Tim Woodruff, Arthur Brown, McCormick, the Pinchot brothers, Hiram Johnson, Meyer Lissner, our own and only Dr. Coe and our irrepressible Dan Kellaher, the immaculate "Bob" Hodge, any political ability? 'Tis cruel and ungrateful thus to disparage one's trusty henchmen.

"Against the bitter hostility of 90 per cent of the country," says the Colonel. Then how came he to get more than 4,000,000 votes? That is considerably more than 10 per cent of the total vote. Two or three million persons must have demonstrated their hostility by voting for him. For such hostility he should be grateful.

"Against the furious opposition of every upholder of special privilege," continues this founder of the Ananias Club. Was Perkins, promoter and director of trusts and beneficiary of high protection, or Munsey, or Hanna, stockholders in the steel trust, or McCormick, stockholder in the harvester trust, furiously opposed to him? Or is La Follette, who did furiously oppose him, an upholder of special privilege?

"With the channels of information to the public largely choked," evidently refers to the degree to which the newspapers and magazines were choked with Roosevelt's speeches, with the proceedings of his convention, with the claims of his managers to a majority of the electoral college.

Roosevelt says the battle for social and industrial justice has just begun. Those of us who have read history are under the impression that such a battle was carried on in the days of the Greek and Roman republics; by the English, who won Magna Charta, drove out the Stuarts, established a democratic monarchy and are now inaugurating some of the social reforms which the Colonel proposes to introduce into this country; by the Swiss when they founded their republic, and the Dutch, when they drove out the Spaniards; by the French, when they drove out the Bourbons and the Bonapartes and founded a republic. Finally, we cannot forget that the struggle for social and industrial justice began in America with the Revolution, was continued by the Republican party when it emancipated the slaves, and has been carried on by that party to this day. Some of the very measures recommended in the Roosevelt platform have already been made law by the Republican party, headed by Taft, and others were being pushed forward by that party before the Progressive party was born. The direct primary was adopted in Republican Wisconsin and taken up in Republican Oregon before Roosevelt had evinced any interest in it. In fact, instead of having just begun the battle, the Progressive party has come on the field when the enemy is yielding at all points and it is just in time to join in the pursuit and share the spoils.

GOVERNOR OR PEOPLE?

If the sovereign people ordered the execution of five men at one general murderers' clean-up, it must be all right; for we have long heard that the people make no mistakes. Yet, strangely enough, the loud outcry about the proposed performance of the legal tragedy at Salem comes from sources that are persistently proclaiming the infallibility of public judgments against any other opinion or influence or conclusion or action by any official or authority or body whatsoever.

But it is petty and silly to intimate that the people are to blame because five men, confined in prison and awaiting their doom, are to be the victims of a theatrical spectacle, staged by the Governor of Oregon, and designed as a horrible example for the intimidation of the public mind and conscience. It is foolish to pretend that if the "execution of one criminal in one day is a good thing, the execution of five criminals in one day ought to be five times as good." If the purpose of hanging five men at one fell swoop and in one grand rope-fest were to make five times as impressive the power of the law and the vindication of justice, it would be the thing to do. But when its whole motive is to illustrate and emphasize merely the so-called brutality and cruelty of the law and of the popular verdict under the law, a different issue is presented.

The stern decrees of justice ought to be carried out in seemly and orderly fashion. It is the Governor's duty so to do. He was elected for that purpose. He is given certain discretionary powers as to time and method. He sought to shift upon the people at the last election the responsibility of changing the law and of endorsing his proposal that capital punishment be abolished. The people refused to uphold him. But they took from the Governor none of his powers of reprieve or commutation.

The Oregonian has nowhere and at no time suggested that the five men at Salem be not hanged. It has protested only against the widespread advertisement given to the Governor's grewsome show on December 13, and against his poor attempt to blame the people for ordering an exhibition that he, and he alone, arranged, and that he, and he alone, may prevent.

NEW PARTY MOVEMENT FAILS.

The organization of a new party can only be said to be successful when it causes the practical disruption of both the leading existing parties. If either of the old parties stands with substantially unimpaired strength, and if the new party draws its members almost solely from the other old party, then there is no new political alignment; there is only a split in one of the old parties. The seceding faction may return and gain control of the machinery, or it may be won back by concessions, but in either case the same party continues to exist.

Tried by this test and by comparing results with the purpose and hopes announced beforehand by Roosevelt, the attempt to establish the Progressive party as a permanent political organization has failed. Roosevelt proclaimed in beginning his enterprise that he would split the solid South and enlist the progressive element of the Democracy in his ranks. So confident was he of doing so that he turned the cold shoulder to the negroes lest he arouse the prejudices of the Southern whites. But he signally failed. The vote of the South shows that section to be as solidly Democratic as ever. Wilson polled probably 90 per cent of the normal Democratic vote of the North. What proportion of his Republican votes represents genuine preference of him to any other candidate, not merely a desire to defeat Roosevelt, is impossible to estimate, but it probably more than offsets the votes he lost to Roosevelt. The Progressive party is thus in no essential particular a new party born of the dissolution of the old parties.

Nor does the new party advance any new principles which differentiate it clearly from the old parties. Its platform is borrowed partly from the Republicans, partly from the Democrats, partly from the Socialists in the desire to win votes from all three. In proposing to enlarge the Federal power, it borrows the Republican ideal of National unity and supremacy, but carries that ideal to extremes. Its plans for increasing the power of the people are borrowed from the Democrats, but it proposes to go a little further in that direction than the traditional champions of popular sovereignty. Its scheme of social and industrial justice only differs from those of the other two parties in proposing to carry paternalism to a point where it becomes frank Socialism. Its proposed Government sanction and regulation of monopoly is distinctly Socialist, for there would be but one more step to Government ownership of industry, which is the Socialist ideal.

Believers in National sovereignty will adhere to the Republican party, which will promote that principle without associating it with others which genuine Republicans disapprove. Believers in popular rule will look to progressive leaders in both old parties, for the reactionary element has become a negligible factor in both. Believers in Socialism will be content with no half measures, and will stick to their own party. As to the measures for bettering the condition of workmen of which the Progressives make so much, some have already been made law by the Republicans, others are favored by both Republicans and Democrats, and of the remainder, some are now being worked out and would have become law in a few years, had the Progressive party never been born. So little remains that it affords too slender a foundation for a new National party.

FIXING THE BLAME.

Having had a hand in the opening of a $32,000 warchest in the last campaign and with possibility that another may be raised, W. G. Eggleston quite naturally objects to Judge Lowell's plan for restricting use of the initiative. In a letter published in another newspaper he expresses the fear that it would kill the initiative.

The Oregonian is not prepared to endorse Judge Lowell's plan as the best method for preventing misuse of the initiative but it sees cause for criticism in the attempts of Eggleston and others to cloud the issue by the old, old argument that an imperfect, incompetent, ineffective Legislature was to blame for the large number of measures on the ballot.

If inefficiency and irresponsiveness to public will on the part of the law-making body had been responsible for the large number of measures presented in the recent campaign the fact would have been shown in the adoption of a large percentage of those measures. As the people declared they did not want two-thirds of them, how is the Legislature at all to blame for not enacting them? Not more than three of the adopted measures can by any stretch of imagination be named as acts which the Legislature knew the people desired yet proved remiss.

If submission by the Legislature of a number of measures which failed of adoption proves that the Legislature is incompetent, submission by Mr. Eggleston and his co-workers of measures which were not approved demonstrated his and their incompetency as well. He can't criticise the Legislature on that score without criticising himself.

If Mr. Eggleston and other repudiated lawyers would look longer on the facts and less on the warchest they might be of some assistance in correcting political and governmental ills in Oregon, chief of which is the freedom given paid tinkerers and theorists to procure with money the submission of measures that threaten the financial standing of the state.

THE PROBLEM OF JESUS.

The Oregonian recurs to the question of the historicity of Jesus on account of an editorial article in the Jewish Tribune for November 15. In that article certain considerations of more or less weight were advanced against our conclusion and we think it is probably worth while to answer them. We may premise, however, that the Tribune treats the subject with an assured dogmatism which is in striking contrast to the spirit of the great scholars who have handled it in "The Jewish Encyclopedia." We quote, for example, the following from the Tribune, not to excite the reader's distaste, but to compare it later with the quotations from Joseph Jacobs, late president of the Jewish Historical Society of England, and from Samuel Krauss, of the Normal College at Budapest. This is what the Tribune says: "The belief that the Jews crucified Jesus has been sucked in by Christian children with their mother's milk and strengthened by bigoted clergymen and old maids in whose hands it is given to kill in the Christian child any love for the Jews." If this is its real purpose it has been hopelessly unsuccessful in the United States, where the Jews are as well "loved" as any other citizens.

The reader is invited to compare the Tribune's uncharitable words with the following, taken from Jacob Jacobs' article on "Jesus," in the Jewish Encyclopedia: He was "born at Nazareth about 2 B. C." This article contains only "a sketch of the main historical events in the public career of Jesus." "He was one of a rather large family, having four brothers." "He earned his living by his father's trade." The Jewish rabble demanded Barabbas of Pilate "and Jesus was left to undergo the Roman punishment of crucifixion in company with two malefactors." These passages explicitly admit all that The Oregonian contended for in relation to the historicity of Jesus and, it is only fair to add, they represent the best and most catholic scholarship of the gifted people for which the Tribune somewhat crudely pretends to speak. Our position is assailed in three paragraphs, of which we shall take the liberty to notice the third first.

In this paragraph the Tribune attacks our statement that the best evidence for the historicity of Jesus is the tremendous originality of his doctrine of "The Kingdom." On this point let us quote Professor Samuel Krauss in the Jewis Encyclopedia: "A great historic movement of the character and importance of Christianity cannot have arisen without a great personality to call it into existence and to give it shape and direction." This sustains our point so well that perhaps nothing more ought to be said about it and yet we cannot refrain from noticing how completely the Tribune manages to misunderstand what Jesus meant by The Kingdom. To offset our argument we are told that a universal "kingdom of God" was mentioned in the Jewish Bible "many times," also by Philo and others. Hence "even this last argument of The Oregonian cannot change the opinion of Jesus being a myth and the New Testament a unification of Jewish ethics and pagan stories."

Here is, indeed, a case of the light shining in darkness and the darkness comprehending it not. It can be asserted categorically on the authority of the best scholars in the world that Jesus' concept of the kingdom was totally different from the theocracy so often spoken of by Old Testament writers. He was a thorough-going social reformer, from the human standpoint at any rate, and the regenerated world was not to be a paradise of priest and ritual, but a place where the meek, the poor, the oppressed, the hungry for righteousness, should find their deserts. The original society of the Christians was modeled after his teaching. It was so unlike anything the Jewish authorities had ever seen or imagined that they at once tried to break it up by persecution. It was so unlike any institution existing anywhere in the Roman Empire that wherever the Christians went with their new social ideals they were pursued as outlaws. Jesus' concept of The Kingdom was alien to both Jewish and pagan thought and for centuries it was lost from Christian thought, but now it is coming back. How could a civilization built on slavery and warfare understand the doctrine of brotherhood?

The weight of this point depends largely on the reader's historical perspective. The more he knows of the ancient world, its literature, both sacred and profane, its art and its practical ethics, the more it will count with him. The miracle of Jesus' basic doctrine grows more stupendous as we learn to appreciate its unalloyed originality. But there are two or three other matters which we wish to touch upon. For this purpose we quote from the Tribune's paragraph 1: "Besides Drews and Schmidt there are other men of learning who deny Jesus' real existence." Now we quoted from Schmidt a passage which proves that he does not "deny Jesus' real existence," but admits it and says it cannot reasonably be questioned. In the face of this the Tribune calmly persists that he is on the other side. When facts make no impression on a person, what are you going to do with him?

Our critic goes on to say that Paul's evidence "must be excluded," because he was not an eyewitness. This is nonsense. He obtained his reports from eyewitnesses, as Thucydides did his accounts of the Peloponnesian war, and there is no evidence that he was not a truthful man. Again we must exclude the gospels because they are still farther than Paul from the events and are in Greek, while Jesus used Aramaic. This again is nonsense. According to Schmidt the synoptic gospels are based on an Aramaic gospel which was virtually contemporaneous with the organization of the primitive church. It must have been written by an eyewitness, so that our account of Jesus is not really hearsay but the report of a man who saw and knew.

MISCONCEPTIONS OF EUGENICS.

The publication by the Houghton-Mifflin Company of Havelock Ellis' new book, "The Task of Social Hygiene," gives a welcome opportunity to the ignorant, the vicious and the foolish to exploit their notions of eugenics. Naturally that subject plays an important part in Havelock Ellis' book, since it lies at the foundation of any substantial and lasting achievement in the field of social hygiene. Before we can expect much permanent improvement in human conditions we must manage to provide the race with reasonably well-formed minds and bodies. This is the problem of eugenics. It is pitiful when the whole matter is so plain and simple to see the misunderstandings which have arisen about it. Some of them no doubt are willful. The recent reviewer in the New York Times, who says that the plans of the eugenicists are "sentimental, visionary and impracticable," must know better. Otherwise his obvious lack of intelligence would cut off his means of livelihood. But there are some persons who really believe that eugenics means a wholesale effort to deprive the majority of mankind of the blessings of domestic life.

The writer in the Times to whom we have referred encourages this silly notion. "The new eugenist," he inanely remarks, "wishes to keep the sinner from fatherhood. And not only the sinners are to be restrained from marriage, but the invalid, the mentally or physically deficient, all, in fact, who are not almost perfect. No more destructive unions like those which produced the consumptive Keats and Stevenson, the lame Byron and Scott," and so on through the wonted rigmarole of nonsense. It might be a sufficient reply to all this to say that the absorbing purpose of eugenics is to bring about marriages which shall produce Byrons and Shelleys in the world of intellect and well-developed athletes in the world of flesh and blood. No eugenist of any importance desires to withhold the privilege of marriage and children from persons of decent lives, be they sick or well, Apollos or Calibans. That is not the purpose at all. Certainly it is not the purpose to banish everybody "who is not almost perfect" from domestic happiness. There is a comparatively small class of people in the world to whom matrimony and its consequences ought to be made impossible. This class, as we say, is small, but it is pernicious out of all proportion to its numbers. From it originate the hereditary thieves, the congenital idiots, the men and women of perverted sexual passion, whose careers mean misery to themselves and social poison to the rest of mankind. With such persons there is but one way to deal. Our friend of the New York Times sagely remarks that "reams of law and armies of police cannot keep men from begetting children." This is true enough, but the surgeon's knife can do it easily, and that instrument ought to be applied relentlessly when it has been proved beyond a doubt that any man's progeny are sure to bring peril to society and unhappiness to themselves. It would be far better for Portland and Oregon if this simple operation were allowable in the case of the perverts who have lately been brought to justice than to shut them up in prison, where they will merely infect all around them with the venom of their disease.

But this particular point is not by any means the gist of eugenics. The task which the new sicence sets for itself is almost purely educational. Its aim is not to forbid marriage to any class of people, large or small, except the one which we have described, but to teach men and women to choose their life partners wisely. The way to improve the human race is not to force celibacy upon people, but to mate them by such rules that undesirable qualities shall be eliminated and good ones perpetuated. The fundamental principle of the subject is that a good trait cannot possibly be transmitted to offspring unless at least one of the parents possesses it. Ex nihil nihil fit. Almost as important is the correlative principle that a bad trait is almost certain to be transmitted if both parents possess it. From these truths one might easily derive all the rules of marriage for which eugenists particularly care. The first is that each parent ought to have the good qualities which the other lacks, at least he ought to have them to a reasonable extent. No sensible eugenist looks for swift perfection in the matter. This rule, if it were observed, would give children an even chance for a sound heredity, no matter how defective their parents might be individually.

The second rule touches not upon mere defects but upon traits which are positively bad. If both parents possess such a trait the offspring are almost certain to inherit it. But if only one parent has it, the children stand a fair chance to escape. Here again the aim of the eugenist is not to deprive men and women of the privilege of marriage but to give their children a good start in life. The sentimental objector to common sense in this matter looks entirely to the romantic "rights" of silly people to make foolish marriages. The eugenist wishes to persuade them by education to make marriages which shall not only issue in happiness to themselves but also produce children capable of happy and useful lives. Which is the better plan? There is another mistaken notion pertaining to this subject which should not be allowed to pass without comment. It is supposed by many persons that eugenics escourages "race suicide." This is not the fact. What it really encourages is race conservation. The eugenist prefers a reasonable number of children well born, well bred and well situated in life to an innumerable horde brought into the world to starve, suffer from preventable diseases, become addicted to vice and prematurely die. The new science is wise enough not to confuse "fertility" with virility. A married couple may be vigorous and entirely normal without bringing a host of children into the world. The common mistake that continence means sterility needs prompt and frequent correction. Eugenics wishes to confer upon the human race the obvious benefits which must ensue from applying common sense and sound morals to marriage.

THE "THIRD DEGREE."

The "third degree," as used in Chicago, is condemned by Professor Edwin R. Keedy on novel but sensible grounds, and he suggests amendments to the Illinois law forbidding such practices under pain of imprisonment, declaring admissions made under the third degree inadmissible as evidence and forbidding publication in newspapers of statements or comments which create a belief in the guilt of the accused before his trial. Professor Keedy condemns the third degree, not only on its merits, but because it affords attorneys an excuse for the plea of police persecution and thus enables them to secure acquittal of many guilty men.

The third degree is a favorite expedient of policemen and detectives who are incompetent to obtain evidence by any other means than a confession or to obtain a confession otherwise than by brutality. A confession thus extorted is as worthless as were the recantations obtained by the Inquisition by torture on the rack. The essential requisite of a confession is that it should be made without coercion or promise of reward or immunity from punishment. Only then should it be accepted as reliable evidence, and the defense can then be debarred from making it the pretext for an appeal to prejudice against the police.

There are, however, features of our law which too greatly favor persons accused of crime. One of these is the presumption of innocence until guilt is proved. In a magazine article on the Rosenthal murder, Magistrate Corrigan of New York maintains that the law should presume neither guilt nor innocence, but should simply hold judgment in suspense. Another is the rule of law that the accused cannot be compelled to testify. Mr. Corrigan cannot see why a prisoner should not be compelled to offer for what it is worth his explanation of suspicious circumstances. Arthur Train, in writing of the Camorra trial, also called attention to the latitude allowed courts in Italy and France in the effort to ferret out the truth regarding a crime. Were similar latitude allowed in this country and were a prisoner required to testify, there would be much less excuse for resort to "the third degree."

THE EUROPEAN CRISIS.

When the great powers of Europe go into conference to arrange a new settlement of the Turkish question, as they almost certainly will, they will be divided into two groups of three—the triple alliance, composed of Germany, Austria and Italy, and the triple entente, composed of Great Britain, France and Russia. These two combinations are described by W. Morton Fullerton in an article in the London National Review, in very different terms. He calls the triple entente "a pact between powers united by a common interest and by a genuine reciprocal regard," while he calls the triple alliance "a self-denying ordinance between three mortal enemies, who have decided to grip each other as tightly as they can, lest, if any one of them be given elbow room, he should fly at the others' throats."

The pacific purpose of the triple entente and its ability to enforce its will were recognized by the German Emperor in his authorized statement as to the conclusions reached by him and the Czar when they met at Port Baltic last July. He said:

> There could be no question either of new agreements, because there was no particular occasion for them, or of producing alterations of any kind in the grouping of the European powers, the value of which for the maintenance of equilibrium and of peace has already been proved.

This is declared by Mr. Fullerton to be "the direct result of forces actively at work during the previous years, of which Agadir may be taken as the supreme symbol." He calls the Moroccan settlement a humiliation for Germany, a provisional settlement of only one of the differences between France and Germany and says it has revealed the triple entente as "bound to upset the whole balance of power in the Baltic, the North Seat and eventually in the Mediterranean." He calls the Kaiser's confession that the triple entente is permanent an echo of the declaration made three months earlier by the new German Ambassador to London that "no diplomatic artifice could possibly destroy the friendship between France and England" and that Germany must accept these new conditions.

The Balkan war is declared to make it "all the more necessary for the powers of the triple entente to entrench themselves and to prepare for contingencies." Warning is given that Germany is reviving its old policy of blandishment of France and against the German suggestion that "in the Balkan crisis the position of France and Germany is almost identical."

The triple entente is advised to work together throughout the world and to put its houses in order, ready to do business with Germany. French and English interests in the Mediterranean are held almost identical, the renewal of the triple alliance not necessarily imperiling the naval position of the two powers in that region. Opening of the Dardanelles to the Russian Black Sea fleet is recommended as rendering "more stable the balance of power in the Middle Sea."

While the interests of the triple entente are almost identical, those of the triple alliance are conflicting. Italy's seizure of Tripoli forestalled a German scheme to secure from Turkey the concession of a North African coaling station and to have been effected through the collusion of France and England. Austria has made the Tyrol "an arsenal of the national defense, a fortified camp dominating Italy." The Tripolitan expedition aggravated Austro-Italian tension concerning the ultimate destination of the Albanian port of Valona and the Italian Foreign Minister eight years ago admitted that the possessor of the Albanian coast would have "the uncontested military and naval supremacy of the Adriatic." This same Minister, now Ambassador to Paris, "has been the most assiduous companion" of Isvolski, the Russian Ambassador, who dreams of offering an open Dardanelles to his sovereign. Italy, too, dreams of unredeemed Italy—Trieste and Trent—which is still held by Austria, and the enthusiasm generated by the Tripolitan war has given fresh vigor to irredentism. While Austria has gained Bosnia and Herzegovina and Italy has gained Tripoli through the triple alliance, Germany has gained nothing. Were there no triple alliance, the parties to it might fly at each other's throats, hence Mr. Fullerton says: "It is in the interest of the peace of the world that that pact be renewed"; that "the triple entente has need of the triple alliance; it needs the alliance in order to simplify its own problems."

The balance of power in the Mediterranean requires that the members of the triple entente hold together there. If Italy's desire to hold the island of Rhodes, which "commands the route of the Dardanelles, Asia Minor and the Suez Canal, counterbalances Cyprus and menaces Malta and Bizerta," should be opened to Russia, Austria, which has long yearned to take Salonica, and France, which holds a protectorate over all Eastern Christians, would claim compensation.

Since Mr. Fullerton's article was written the Balkan league has been victorious at all points and Turkey holds only a few outlying fortresses and stretches of territory in Europe, besides her capital. The problems which the powers have to solve, complicated already and fraught with many possibilities of friction, have been rendered still more complicated by this changed situation. When the Berlin Congress settled Turkish affairs in 1878 the Balkan states took what the powers chose to give. Flushed with victory and confident in their new-found military strength, they will now, if they hold together, assert their right to hold what they have taken. Should Austria use force to keep Servia from reaching the Adriatic, Russia may come to Servia's defense and join Bulgaria in driving the Turks from Constantinople. Once at war, Russia would not stop there, but would seize Armenia and could only be checked in her career of Asiatic conquest by the necessity of defending her European frontier against Austria and Germany. By presenting a firm and united front against Austrian interference, the triple entente may prove that the Kaiser spoke truly when he admitted its value for the maintenance of peace.

The fate of the men on trial at Indianapolis for a dynamite conspiracy depends on the fullness with which the amazing story of McManigal can be corroborated. That story is so circumstantial and complete in all its details as to forbid the belief that it is a fabrication, but the precedent of Orchard's confession at Boise shows that a jury is unwilling to convict on the evidence of an accomplice and informer without ample corroboration. It is possible to credit the story told by a monster like Orchard or McManigal of his own misdeeds, and yet to doubt the truth of his statements implicating others. A jury might, therefore, believe McManigal guilty of every crime he confessed without being convinced that others named in his story were guilty. The Government's case depends on its ability to confirm the conspiracy charge by producing documentary evidence and the testimony of disinterested witnesses. The informer is viewed with suspicion and contempt, both by his former confederates and by those who use him to vindicate justice.

If Wilson puts Bryan in his Cabinet he will almost surely provoke contention with Clark and Underwood. If he leaves Bryan out, the Nebraskan will be more free to stir up trouble, though not in as good a position to disturb the center of government. Wilson may need a month's solitude in Bermuda, to decide between these two alternatives alone, leaving out of consideration the many other difficult questions which confront him.

Professor Ernest C. Moore, of Yale, investigated the New York school system for forty days, as he says, spending "most of that time in the offices of the Board of Education." What a typically professional way of investigating a school system that has for its object the education of live, squirming, restless children.

Captain Rostran, hero of the Titanic wreck, is to be decorated with a gold medal. An appropriate decoration fashioned of sole leather should be bestowed on Director Ismay.

Japan boasts a 50 per cent increase of wages during the past ten years. A first-class workman must get as high as ten and twelve cents a day now.

Latest statistics show that more unmarried men than married ones go crazy. Worry, then, mustn't have anything to do with insanity.

When a football player is laid out many of the spectators wonder if he isn't posing for the benefit of his best girl in the grandstand.

An English inventor announces a soundless gun. Now will some benefactor of mankind devise a noiseless political campaign.

A Boston preacher would strike the word hell out of the English language. But what would old-time preachers do for a text?

Governor Wilson's huff over a camera snapshot may be intended as a gentle hint that it's time to quit calling him Woody.

Austria has called out her reserves and Russia is mobilizing a few field armies. Probably getting ready to seize the spoils.

A deserted California town is to be sold at auction. Here's a rare chance for some budding Mayoralty aspirant.

It is probably well that the vagrant who got the local pastor's shoes wasn't ragged.

The peanut crop having all but failed, baseball will lose a great ally in 1913.

Why not a pension, too, for our perennial Presidential candidates?

Is the European cauldron about to come to a boil?

Scraps and Jingles

Leone Cass Baer.

Say, that was a great show at the Orpheum last week. It brought down the house.

* * *

Woman seeking a divorce whines "that she can't live within her husband's income." Bet two cents she'll find it easier to live within it than without it.

* * *

A telephone girl does not follow either a profession or a business, but a calling.

* * *

Most married men prefer clinging gowns. They'd like one to cling to you for about three years.

* * *

"The face is an index to the mind"
Is a proverb whose truth I fail to find
In case of a woman who makes up her face
That her mind's made up too isn't always the case.

* * *

Statistics prove that blonde women are more difficult to get along with than brunettes, which statement will lead many a man to believe that his wife has dyed her hair dark.

* * *

A woman who believes her husband would remain a widower if she dies is foolish. Anyone of them will wed a second time if the trap is set in a different way.

* * *

Definition of a labor-saving device—marrying for money.

* * *

Men who rave over her liquid voice before marriage, discover later that her words come in torrents.

* * *

I've discovered why men slick their hair up off their brows like a new little calf's. It's because they're too tired or too lazy to part it.

* * *

Agnes writes to ask advice about marrying "the most upright, honorable high-minded and artistic man in the world."

Don't do it, Agnes. You'll starve to death.

* * *

Loose big brown shoes,
With toes much worn,
The large feet of Lizzie
These Fall days adorn.
Not the shock on the pumpkin,
Nor the frost at morn
Cause Lizzie's Autumn shoeing—
It's the cutting of the corn.

* * *

One of those "That's not me" letters says that "talkative women seem to be more popular with men than any other kind." I didn't know there was another kind, did you?

* * *

Tailors as a class take little stock in this twaddle about old families. For instance they'd rather see than hear of the early settlers.

* * *

Again the headline: "Turks Are Beheaded," and Thanksgiving four days away.

* * *

Miss Calamity Step And Fetch It, the cultured and cheerful idiot lady of the Willamette Valley, is hatching up a poem on Turkey — domestic not foreign—and if there is no Balkan on the part of the Muse, she will have it ready for slaughter next scrap and jingle day.

Nitts On Call of the Farm

By Dean Collins.

Nescius Nitts, sage of Punkindorf Station,
Whose logic at all times defied refutation,
Paused a moment—a nicotine conglomeration
Put a wasp in a state of anesthetization.
Then Nescius spake upon soil cultivation.

We hitched up the wagon this week and we druv
To Portland, myself here and Philomel Love,
To take in the sights that they has on display
At that there big Land Show, and I'm here to say
There ain't nothin' like it I ever yet see—
Not even our fair here in '73.

We seen all the fruit and the punkins and wheat
In size an' magnificence not to be beat;
In fact, 'twas so fine that we jest hung aroun',
Fergettin' to go and to look at the town.
And Phil says, as we strolls aroun' arm in arm,
"There sure is some merits to things from the farm."

And folks looked at us and the show, through the day,
Quite frequent in really an envious way;
(Them fellers that allus has lived in the city
And used to look at me with somewhat of pity,
When I druv to town, semi-annually,
To lay in supplies, back in '73).

They looked at us now, and they spoke of the charm
Of rural surroundin's, and "Back to the Farm"
I heard them a-sayin' 'most everywhere,
And talkin' of gardens and fruit trees out there;
And Phil and myself was consumed with surprise
At bein' the cynosure-like, of all eyes.

And I says to Phil: "Back in '73
Things wouldn't have been thus fer you and fer me,
But times they has changed, and the city man's toll
Plumb makes him to hunger and thirst fer the soil
And look on the farmer as one of great worth—
Which means you and me now is the cream of the earth."

Portland, November 23.

The Truth and the Whole Truth.

Philadelphia Telegraph.

A young man was at luncheon with a young woman at her home one Sunday evening. Little Jimmy broke the silence to remark:

"Say, Mr. Smith, you certainly did look fine last night, sittin' beside sister on the parlor sofa with your arm——"

"Jimmy, be quiet," the girl screamed, blushing scarlet.

"Well, he did look fine," said Jimmy. "He had his arm——"

"Jimmy, will you be still?" exclaimed the mother.

"Why?" whined the lad. "He did have his arm——"

"James," said the father, "go straight upstairs to bed!"

The boy rose. He began to cry. As he left the room he said:

"I don't know what's the matter with you folks. I was only going to say he had his army uniform on—and he had, too."

In Choosing a Wife.

Life.

Howard — Hasn't Bachelor waited rather long before choosing a wife?

Coward—Bless you, no! He's only had a marrying income since he was 60.